AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner has rejected the specification based on numerous locations of missing spaces, citing exemplarity locations such as between "testing" and "The" on page 26, line 1 of paragraph [0060]. In examining the published version of the specification, Application does not find the errors pointed out by the Examiner. Applicant requests a telephone interview to review and identify any objectable or rejectable formatting errors in the published specification, which Application will happily correct. Applicant has detected the following missing colons (":") in paragraph subheadings, and requests appropriate amendment to the specification to correct these errors, asserting that these changes are not for the purpose of patentability. These amendment requests are made in reference to Application Publication No. 2005/000802863 A1, and supersedes any and all amendment requests made in the application thus far.

Please replace paragraph [0061] with the following amended paragraph:

[0061] ~~Stabilization Phase~~ Stablization Phase: The stabilization phase was intended to establish the strength and reliability of dietary preferences. Canines were tested for 20 days using a procedure identical to that during the discrimination-learning procedure. The number of choices to each object during this phase was used to establish food preference.

Please replace paragraph [0062] with the following amended paragraph:

[0062] ~~Reversal Phase~~ Reversal Phase: This test phase was instituted after completing the stabilization phase. The purpose was to determine whether the preferences remained after the objects associated with the two test foods were switched. In this phase, as in the previous phase,

the initially preferred object was never associated with any food. The objects associated with the test foods, however, were switched, such that the object associated with the moist test food type in the earlier phases was now associated with the dry test food and vice versa. This phase included association days, a training phase and stability phase, as described above.

Please replace paragraph [0063] with the following amended paragraph:

[0063] ~~Data Analysis~~ Data Analysis: The number of choices of the non-preferred objects during the stabilization phases was used to establish the food preference. A food-preference ratio, calculated by dividing the number of choices to the object associated with the moist test food by the sum of the choices of the object associated with the moist and dry test foods, was used to describe the individual data. Using this measure, a score of 0.5 indicated no preference for either food, while a score of 1.0 indicated a complete preference for the moist test food. Statistical analyses were conducted using Statistica 6.0c with significance set to $P<0.05$. Individual choices over the stabilization days were analyzed using a two-way repeated-measures ANOVA, with test phase (2 factors) and object (3 factors) serving as within-subject variables. Post-hoc analysis was conducted using Tukey's LSD test if appropriate.

Please replace paragraph [0065] with the following amended paragraph:

[0065] ~~Procedure~~ Procedure: Dogs were trained on a three choice object discrimination learning procedure. After establishing object preferences in the first phase, the preferred object was associated with no reward, a second object was associated with the dry food and the third object was associated with a highly palatable moist food in the second phase. In the second phase, the dogs were trained on the discrimination learning procedure until they learned to avoid the non-rewarded object. They were subsequently given an additional 20 test sessions during a

stabilization phase. In the reversal learning phase, the object-food associations were modified, such that the object that was previously associated with moist food was now associated with the dry food, and vice versa. Once the dogs learned to avoid the non-rewarded object, they were tested on the discrimination learning procedure for another 20 sessions during an additional stabilization phase.

Please replace paragraph [0066] with the following amended paragraph:

[0066] ~~Results~~ Results: The object associated with the moist food was chosen to a greater extent than the other objects, indicating a strong preference for the moist food.

Please replace paragraph [0067] with the following amended paragraph:

[0067] ~~Materials and Methods~~ Materials and Methods: Subjects Two male and three female beagle dogs from our colony at the University of Toronto were used. Two dogs were between three and five years of age and the remaining dogs were between nine and twelve. All the dogs had been in the colony for at least one year and all had previous experience on a variety of tests of cognitive function. The subjects were housed individually in pens measuring approximately 1.07×1.22 m and were fed once daily after palatability testing. Water was available ad libitum. Dogs were maintained on a 12:12-hr light-dark cycle and were exercised daily while their pens were cleaned. All canines underwent regular clinical examinations and had no health problems throughout the duration of the study.

Please replace paragraph [0068] with the following amended paragraph:

[0068] ~~Apparatus~~ Apparatus: A wooden chamber based on the Wisconsin General Test Apparatus (previously described in Milgram et al., 1994) was used for palatability testing. Vertical stainless steel bars, covering the front of the box, provided access to the objects and test foods associated with them. Objects were presented on a sliding Plexiglas tray, which contained one medial and two lateral food wells. The test foods could be accessed by displacement of the appropriate object from above the food well. The dogs and the tester were separated by a wooden screen, which had a hinged door at the bottom, to allow presentation of the sliding tray, and a one-way mirror above, which permitted the tester to view the subject. An incandescent 60-watt light attached to the front of the chamber served as the only source of lighting during testing.

Please replace paragraph [0069] with the following amended paragraph:

[0069] ~~Food Comparisons~~ Food Comparisons: Two foods were compared in this study: Purina Agribrands Canine Lab Chow #5006a, a dry food, which also served as the regular daily diet for all the subjects, and Hill's Prescription Diet (P/D)$_b$, a moist dog food, intended to be highly palatable.

Please replace paragraph [0070] with the following amended paragraph:

[0070] ~~Design~~ Design: Palatability testing was divided into four phases: a preference and association phase, a discrimination learning phase, a stabilization phase, and a reversal phase.

Please replace paragraph [0071] with the following amended paragraph:

[0071] First Phase: preference and association ~~testing The~~ testing. The preference test was used to determine object preferences. Three different objects were presented to the canines for twelve trials, each associated with approximately one gram of Hill's P/D diet. The positions of the objects were randomized among the three possible well positions ensuring all possible combinations occurred equally within the twelve trials and the number of responses to each object was recorded. The object chosen most often was considered to be the canine's preferred object. In the subsequent discrimination phase, the preferred object was associated with no reward.

Please replace paragraph [0073] with the following amended paragraph:

[0073] Second Phase: discrimination-learning ~~procedure During~~ procedure. During the discrimination-learning procedure, the canines were given 12 trials for each daily session with an interval of 30 seconds separating each trial. Each trial began with the simultaneous presentation of the three objects to the canine. The location of each object was varied in a quasirandom manner to assure that all possible combinations of object placement occurred equally during a twelve trial test session (see FIG. 1 as an example). The preferred object, determined in the preference test, was never placed over food, and the remaining objects were always placed over the test food associated with them during the association days. A trial ended after the canine displaced one of the three objects and retrieved the food (unless they responded to the object associated with no reward).

Please replace paragraph [0075] with the following amended paragraph:

[0075] ~~Stabilization Phase~~ Stablization Phase: The stabilization phase was intended to establish the strength and reliability of dietary preferences. Canines were tested for at least 10 days using a

procedure identical to that during the discrimination-learning procedure. The number of choices to each object during this phase was used to establish food preference.

Please replace paragraph [0076] with the following amended paragraph:

[0076] ~~Reversal Phase~~ Reversal Phase: This test phase was instituted after completing the stabilization phase. The purpose was to determine whether the preferences remained after the object food association contingencies were modified. In this phase, the initially preferred object was associated with the non-preferred food, the object associated with the preferred food was not rewarded and the object associated with the non-preferred food was associated with the preferred food. This phase included association days, a training phase and stability phase, as described above.

Please replace paragraph [0077] with the following amended paragraph:

[0077] ~~Data Analysis~~ Data Analysis: The number of choices of the non-preferred objects during the stabilization phases was used to establish the food preference. Statistical analyses were conducted using Statistica 6.0c with significance set to $P<0.05$. In order to analyze food preference, individual one-way repeated-measures ANOVAs were conducted with percentage of choices to each food and non-reward serving as a within-subject variable for the original and reversal learning. Post-hoc analysis was conducted using Tukey's LSD test if appropriate.

Please replace paragraph [0081] with the following amended paragraph:

[0081] ~~Procedure~~ Procedure: Dogs were trained on a three choice object discrimination learning procedure. After establishing object preferences in the first phase, the preferred object was associated with non-reward, a second object was associated with the chicken-based test food and the third object was associated with the lamb-based test food in the second phase. Both test foods were similar in appearance and texture and the main difference was the meat flavor. In the second phase, the dogs were trained on the discrimination learning procedure until they learned to avoid the non-rewarded object. They were subsequently given a minimum of 10 additional test sessions, at the very least, during a stabilization phase. In the second phase, which also involved reversal learning, the object-food associations were modified, such that the object that was previously associated with the chicken-based test food was now associated with no reward, the preferred object was associated with the lamb-based test food and the object previously associated with the lamb-based test food was associated with the chicken-based test food. Once the dogs learned to avoid the non-rewarded object, they were tested on the discrimination learning procedure for 10 sessions during an additional stabilization phase.

Please replace paragraph [0082] with the following amended paragraph:

[0082] ~~Results~~ Results: The object associated with the chicken-based test food was chosen to a greater extent than the other objects, indicating a strong preference for this test food.

Please replace paragraph [0083] with the following amended paragraph:

[0083] ~~Materials and Methods Subjects~~ Materials and Methods: Subjects - Three male and three female beagle dogs from our colony at the University of Toronto were used. All dogs were less than seven years of age, had been in the colony for at least one year and had previous experience on a variety of tests of cognitive function. The subjects were housed individually in pens

measuring approximately 1.07×1.22 m and were fed once daily after palatability testing. Water was available ad libitum. Dogs were maintained on a 12:12-hr light-dark cycle and were exercised daily while their pens were cleaned. All canines underwent regular clinical examinations and had no health problems throughout the duration of the study.

Please replace paragraph [0084] with the following amended paragraph:

[0084] ~~Apparatus~~ Apparatus: A wooden chamber based on the Wisconsin General Test Apparatus (previously described in Milgram et al., 1994) was used for palatability testing. Vertical stainless steel bars, covering the front of the box, provided access to the objects and test foods associated with them. Objects were presented on a sliding Plexiglas tray, which contained one medial and two lateral food wells. The test foods could be accessed by displacement of the appropriate object from above the food well. The dogs and the tester were separated by a wooden screen, which had a hinged door at the bottom, to allow presentation of the sliding tray, and a one-way mirror above, which permitted the tester to view the subject. An incandescent 60-watt light attached to the front of the chamber served as the only source of lighting during testing.

Please replace paragraph [0085] with the following amended paragraph:

[0085] ~~Food Comparisons~~ Food Comparisons: Two foods were compared in this study: test foods 1 and 2 were both dry kibble, similar in appearance and texture, but were based on lamb and chicken as a meat source, respectively.

Please replace paragraph [0086] with the following amended paragraph:

[0086] ~~Design~~ Design: Palatability testing was divided into four phases: a preference and association phase, a discrimination training phase, a stabilization phase, and a reversal phase.